

**Appl. No. 09/351,086  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 2 January 2004**

**Page 8 of 9**

**REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1-10 and 18-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Abecassis (USP 6,553,178); and

claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abecassis in view of Jain et al. (USP 6,463,444, hereinafter Jain).

The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-17 depend, and claim 24 specifically recite a method for processing video that includes determining an association between a first video segment and an information source, based on a feature associated with both the video segment and the information source, and displaying information from the information source based on a user's selection of the feature in the video segment while the video segment is being displayed to the user.

Claims 18-20 similarly claim apparatuses that display information from an information source based on a user's selection of a feature in a video segment while the video segment is being displayed to the user.

Claims 21-23 and 25 claim methods or apparatuses that enable display of information from an information source when an associated video segment is being displayed, the association being based on a feature common to both the information source and the video segment.

The Office action relies upon Abecassis for teaching each of the above elements of the independent claims, and relies upon Jain for teaching speech-to-text conversion, which is an element of one or more dependent claims. The applicant concurs with this characterization of Jain, but respectfully disagrees with the asserted characterization of Abecassis, as follows.

Abecassis does not teach selecting a feature in a first video segment that is being displayed, and does not teach displaying information from an information source based on this selection.

Appl. No. 09/351,086  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 2 January 2004

Page 9 of 9


Abecassis teaches that a user creates a set of user preferences, and from this set of user preferences, Abecassis's system finds and displays a video segment corresponding to this set of user preferences. For ease of consistent reference, the set of user preferences is hereinafter termed a feature. Abecassis teaches having the user identify a feature of interest, and then using this feature as a search criteria for locating a video segment having this feature. Abecassis's user does not select the feature of interest in the video segment that is being displayed, because the video segment is not presented to the user until after the feature is selected as the search criteria for finding the video segment.

Further, with regard to claims 21-23 and 25, Abecassis does not teach enabling the display of information from another source when an associated video segment having a common feature with the other source is displayed.

Because Abecassis neither teaches nor suggests selecting a feature from a displayed video segment, and neither teaches nor suggests enabling the display of information from another source when an associated video segment is displayed, as claimed in the applicant's independent claims, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-25 over Abecassis.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney  
Registration Number 41,508  
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road  
Montross, VA 22520  
Phone: 804-493-0707  
Fax: 215-243-7525